

King County Forestry Program

1999 Monitoring Report

December 2000

King County Department of Natural Resources

Pam Bissonnette, Director

Nancy Hansen, Manager, Water and Land Resources Division

Jerry Balcom, Interim Manager, Resource Lands and Open Space Section

Author

Benj Wadsworth, Forestry Program Analyst

Contributing Staff

Tom Beavers

Connie Blumen

Kathy Creahan

Todd Klinka

Bill Loeber

Kristi McClelland

Ted Sullivan

King County Department of Development and Environmental Services

George Horning

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Data.....	1
Current Status.....	2
Rural Forest District.....	2
Forest Production District.....	2
Rural Forest District Fragmentation Indicators.....	3
Parcel Size Distribution.....	3
Ownership Distribution.....	4
Development Status.....	5
Incentive Programs.....	5
Technical Assistance.....	5
Education.....	6
Current Use Taxation.....	9
Transfer of Development Credits.....	9
1999 Highs and Lows.....	12
Highs.....	12
Low.....	12
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	13
Appendix: Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs).....	15
Parcel and Ownership Distribution.....	15
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie.....	15
WRIA 8 – Cedar / Sammamish.....	17
WRIA 9 – Green.....	19
WRIA 10 – White.....	20
Incentive Programs.....	21

List of Tables

Table 1	Public Landowners in the Rural Forest District, 1999.....	2
Table 2	Large Private Landowners in the Rural Forest District, 1999.....	2
Table 3	Public Landowners in the Forest Production District, 1999.....	3
Table 4	Large Private Landowners in the Forest Production District, 1999.....	3
Table 5	Rural Forest District Parcel Size Distribution, 1996 and 1999.....	4
Table 6	Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution, 1996 and 1999.....	4
Table 7	RFD Landowners with greater than 500 Acres, 1996 and 1999.....	5
Table 8	Technical Assistance Program, 1997-1999.....	7
Table 9	Education Program, 1997-1999.....	8
Table 10	Current Use Taxation Applications, 1997-1999.....	10
Table 11	Properties Removed from Current Use Taxation, 1999.....	11
Table 12	Properties Enrolled in Current Use Taxation Program as of 1999.....	11
Table 13	Rural Forest District Parcel Size Distribution in WRIA 7, 1999.....	15
Table 14	Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution in WRIA 7, 1999.....	15
Table 15	Public Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 7, 1999.....	16
Table 16	Large Private Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 7, 1999.....	16
Table 17	Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 7, 1999.....	16
Table 18	Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 7, 1999.....	17
Table 19	Rural Forest District Parcel Size Distribution in WRIA 8, 1999.....	17
Table 20	Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution in WRIA 8, 1999.....	17
Table 21	Public Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 8, 1999.....	18
Table 22	Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 8, 1999.....	18
Table 23	Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 8, 1999.....	18
Table 24	Rural Forest District Parcel Size Distribution in WRIA 9, 1999.....	19
Table 25	Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution in WRIA 9, 1999.....	19
Table 26	Public Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 9, 1999.....	19
Table 27	Large Private Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 9, 1999.....	19
Table 28	Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 9, 1999.....	20
Table 29	Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 9, 1999.....	20
Table 30	Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 10, 1999.....	20
Table 31	Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 10, 1999.....	21
Table 32	Technical Assistance Program by WRIA, 1999.....	21
Table 33	Education Program by WRIA, 1999.....	22
Table 34	Current Use Taxation Program Enrollment by WRIA, 1999.....	22

List of Maps

Map 1	Public and Large Private Ownership in Rural Forest District and Forest Production District
Map 2	Development Status in Rural Forest District and Forest Production District
Map 3	1999 Forestry Technical Assistance and Education Efforts
Map 4	Current Use 1999 Applications & Current Use Enrollees
Map 5	Transfer of Development Credits Sending Sites
Map 6	Highs and Lows

Introduction

This report is the fourth annual monitoring report of the King County Forestry Program. It is a follow-up to the *Forest Monitoring Baseline Report*, which describes the monitoring program and presents the baseline conditions as of the end of 1996. The 1999 report consists of three sections:

1. Current Status - A description of the current parcel size distribution, ownership distribution and existing improvements in the Rural Forest District and the Forest Production District.
2. Rural Forest District Fragmentation Indicators - A comparison of 1996 and 1999 parcel size distribution, ownership distribution, and development status in the Rural Forest District.
3. A summary of participation in the County's forest incentive programs including:
 - Technical Assistance
 - Education
 - Current Use Taxation
 - Transfer of Development Credits

An appendix includes an analysis of the data for each Water Resource Inventory Area.

Data

Information for this report was obtained from a variety of sources.

Information about parcel size and ownership distribution, and information regarding improvements, were derived from data maintained by the King County Assessors office.

Technical assistance data are maintained by the King County foresters in an Access database. Data for the Current Use Taxation program forestland category are maintained by the King County Assessors office. The PBRS/Timberlands program in Resource Lands and Open Space maintains their own database for the PBRS and Timberlands categories.

For the technical assistance and education programs, the data from 1999 have been compared to that of 1997 and 1998 in order to show any significant trends that may be developing. However, because the 1997 report focused specifically on the Rural Forest District (RFD) and the Lower Cedar River Basin, information for many of the areas evaluated in this report is not available for that year. This explains many of the blanks in the associated tables.

Finally, in order to analyze fragmentation in the Rural Forest District, every effort was made to obtain accurate parcel data for both 1996 and 1999. However, an unexplained

discrepancy in the GIS for the total acreage of the Rural Forest District in '96 and '99, an area that technically should be the same, raises some questions about the validity of the results. Nonetheless, the report does provide a good overview of the status of forestland and forestry throughout the County.

Current Status

Rural Forest District

There are 48,126 acres in the Rural Forest District. Of these, 7800 are in public ownership (Table 1, Map 1).

Table 1: Public Landowners in the Rural Forest District, 1999

Public Owner	Parcels	Acres
Washington State	121	4408
King County	108	2717
United States	11	674
City of North Bend	2	80
Total	142	7800

The remaining 40,326 acres are owned by 1911 different owners. Of these, seven are large landowners with more than 500 acres (Table 2, Map 1). The vast majority of the remainder (97%) own less than 100 acres. Combined, the public agencies and the six large landowners manage 40% of the land in the RFD.

Table 2: Large Private Landowners in the Rural Forest District, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Plum Creek	124	4121
Weyerhaeuser	34	2875
Palmer Coking Coal	113	1592
Weyerhaeuser Real Estate	53	1288
McCann	30	584
Port Blakely	30	546
Chen	20	511
Total	404	11,516

Forest Production District

There are 809,970 acres of forestland in the Forest Production District. 543,746 of these are in public ownership (Table 3, Map 1).

Table 3: Public Landowners in the Forest Production District, 1999

Public Owner	Parcels	Acres
United States	856	343,623
City of Seattle	263	98,372
Washington State	502	83,541
City of Tacoma	162	14,987
King County	39	3206
City of Snoqualmie	1	16
Enumclaw School District 216	1	1
Total	1824	543,746

The remaining 265,082 acres are owned by 823 different landowners. Of these, 12 are large landowners with more than 500 acres (Table 4, Map 1). Combined, the public agencies and these 12 large landowners manage 98% of the land in the FPD. 10% of the parcels in the FPD have some form of improvement valued at \$100 or greater (Map 2).

Table 4: Large Private Landowners in the Forest Production District, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Weyerhaeuser*	440	153,758
Plum Creek	231	60,521
Giustina Resources	42	14,336
Longview Fiber	49	9747
Burlington Northern RR	102	2371
Weyerhaeuser Real Estate	3	1278
Gordon E. Hoenig	2	1162
Manke Lumber Co	22	1065
Cugini Land and Timber Co	9	922
Palmer Coking Coal	13	907
Trust for Public Land	6	819
Southworth Land Assoc.	30	615
Jack McCann	6	542
Total	955	248,043

*Since the compilation of this data, Weyerhaeuser has sold roughly 8000 acres in the Raging River watershed to Fruit Growers Supply, an affiliate of Sunkist Growers Inc.

Rural Forest District Fragmentation Indicators

Parcel Size Distribution

As can be seen in Table 5, parcelization in the Rural Forest District in the last three years has resulted in the addition of roughly 500 separate parcels. The number of parcels greater than 100 acres in size decreased from 44 to 41. However, this number is somewhat misleading, as nine large parcels were created, and thirteen were segregated. Seven of the new large parcels were created on land in public ownership. Two were

created by Palmer Coking Coal. Of the thirteen parcels that were segregated into smaller parcels, eleven were owned by Plum Creek (two of which were sold to Harbor Development and Jack McCann), one by Evergreen State Tree Farms, and one by King County (adjacent to Rock Creek Park).

Table 5 also shows a decrease of 13 lots between 25 and 100 acres in size. The segregation of these lots and the 100+ acre lots has resulted in an increase of 515 lots smaller than 17.5 acres. This change is significant given the County's goal of maintaining a 20-acre average parcel size in the Rural Forest District.

Table 5: Rural Forest District Parcel Size Distribution, 1996 and 1999

<i>Parcel size</i>	1996		1999	
	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Total Acres</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Total Acres</i>
≥ 100	44	11,090	41	9356
25 – 99.99	411	15,912	398	15,266
17.5 – 25	654	13,354	666	13,559
7.5 – 17.49	312	3702	409	4625
4 – 7.49	560	2900	728	3824
< 4	992	1332	1242	1495
Total	2973	48,292*	3484	48,126*

*The area covered by the Rural Forest District did not change between 1996 and 1999. As mentioned above, these values differ slightly due to a discrepancy in the GIS data.

Ownership Distribution

Table 6 shows the distribution of ownership size in the Rural Forest District in 1996 and 1999. These data also reflect the trend toward smaller ownerships, as the number of owners with greater than 500 acres decreased while the number in each of the smaller size categories increased. There are seven private landowners with more than 500 acres in the Rural Forest District. In 1996, there were eight. These owners are listed in Table 7.

Table 6: Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution, 1996 and 1999

<i>Ownership</i>	1996		1999	
	<i># of owners</i>	<i>Total acres</i>	<i># of owners</i>	<i>Total acres</i>
≥ 500	10	21,347	9	19,369
100 – 499.99	36	6747	43	8316
40 – 99.99	100	5918	114	6549
20 – 39.99	230	6434	248	6682
4 – 19.99	556	4595	663	5772
< 4	554	831	837	1072
Total	1487	45,872	1914	47,760

Table 7: RFD Landowners with greater than 500 acres, 1996 and 1999

1996			1999		
<i>Owner</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Plum Creek	36	5511	Plum Creek	124	4121
Weyerhaeuser	25	3036	Weyerhaeuser	34	2875
Weyerhaeuser Real Estate	120	2520	Palmer Coking Coal	115	1635
Manke	56	1132	Weyerhaeuser Real Estate	53	1288
Palmer Coking Coal	88	1462	McCann	30	584
Port Blakely	41	785	Port Blakely	30	546
Plateau Associates	32	589	Chen	20	511
Chen	20	511			
Total	418	15546		406	11560

Notes:

- In 1996, McCann did not own any acres in the RFD. The company purchased most of its land from Plum Creek.
- In 1999, Manke owned only 436 acres. In 1998, they sold 1700 acres in the RFD and FPD to the County in the Taylor Mountain Forest deal.
- Plateau Associates owned only 290 acres in 1999. The remaining 299 acres has been sold to individual owners as part of the Uplands Project.
- Between 1996 and 1999, Palmer Coking Coal acquired 173 acres, the majority from PlumCreek.
- Between 1996 and 1999, Port Blakely sold 303 arces to King County in the Ring Hill Forest deal. They also acquired 65 acres from private owners.

Development Status

The assessor's data were used to analyze the change in the amount of development in the Rural Forest District between 1996 and 1999. In 1996, 33% of the parcels had some form of improvement assessed at more than 5% of the value of the underlying land. In 1999, 38% of the parcels had an improvement of this value. In both cases, parcels that did not have any improvement value recorded in the data were assumed to have no improvements (There were 299 such parcels in 1996 and 61 in 1999). While there has been a moderate increase in the number of parcels with improvement, as a percentage of the total land area, the developed area remains fairly small. Sixteen percent was developed in 1996, and 20% in 1999. Map 2 shows the developed parcels in the RFD in 1999.

Incentive Programs

Technical Assistance

The King County technical assistance foresters completed their second full year of employment in 1999. Their role is to assist landowners with forest management plans, promote the incentive programs, teach classes, and respond to a variety of landowner questions and needs. The 1999 efforts of the technical assistance foresters are summarized in Table 8 (page 7) with a comparison to the 1997 and 1998 efforts. Map 3 shows the geographic distribution of the technical assistance efforts.

As can be seen in Table 8, the number of “On site visits” did not increase substantially from 1998 to 1999, as the technical assistance foresters reached their capacity in terms of the amount of time available for on-site visits. However, the number of “Plans completed” increased substantially in 1999, which suggests that the efforts of the technical assistance foresters have been more effective. This may be attributed to the improved methods gained with three years of experience as the program has matured.

Several other conclusions can be drawn from Table 8. Notably, the number of on site visits and plans completed increased substantially in the Forest Production District. This is indicative of the recent trend of residential landowners purchasing land in the FPD. While the County should strive to slow this trend in order to maintain large ownerships in the FPD, it is encouraging that these landowners are seeking assistance in the management of their forestland. Also of note is a decrease in the number of on-site visits in the urban area. This change is appropriate given that the focus of the program is rural forestry.

Education

The education component of the forestry program continues as an interdepartmental effort with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Washington State University Cooperative Extension-King County, KCDDDES and KCDNR all participating. The Forest Stewardship Planning series coaches landowners through the process of developing their own forest management plans. The Forest Advisor series provides intensive training on forestry topics and requires that the course graduates volunteer their time in forestry education or other forestry projects.

The county offered three Forest Stewardship Planning classes in 1999, one each in Covington, Vashon and Carnation. One Forest Advisor Class was offered in combination with the Forest Stewardship Planning class in Covington. Table 9 (page 8) includes a summary of participation in the Forest Stewardship Planning and Forest Advisor classes. There was a substantial increase in the number of students in the Forest Stewardship Planning Class, and a decrease in the number in the Forest Advisor Class. This is a result of a conscious decision by the Forestry program to allocate resources to the Forest Stewardship Planning Class with the belief that this class is a more effective way of educating landowners. Notably, there were seven FPD landowners enrolled in the Forest Stewardship class, whereas in 1998 there were none. Again, this is indicative of the recent proliferation of residential development in the FPD. Map 3 shows the geographic distribution of the education efforts.

Table 8: Technical Assistance Program, 1997-1999 (Blanks spaces in the table indicate that the data were not reported in 1997.)

	1997			1998			1999		
	<i>People</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>People</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>People</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>
<i>On site visits</i>									
Rural Forest District	2		NA	11	22	NA	23	56	NA
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)			NA	36	50	NA	26	34	NA
Forest Production District			NA	2	2	NA	9	10	NA
Vashon Island			NA	22	30	NA	32	40	NA
Urban Area			NA	14	20	NA	0	0	NA
Total	23*		NA	88**	132**	NA	92**	148**	NA
<i>Plans completed</i>									
Rural Forest District		2	20	3	3	78	13	42	876
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)				9	12	87	19	26	167
Forest Production District				1	1	20	8	8	139
Vashon Island				20	29	247	16	21	165
Urban Area				0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	15*	20*	215*	34**	47**	457**	61**	104**	1347
<i>Phone contacts</i>									
Total				70	NA	NA	250	NA	NA

* This is the total for the entire county. Information for the various areas within the county was not reported in 1997.

** These totals exceed the sum of the various areas due to the fact that some of the records do not match parcels in the GIS data.

Table 9: Education Program, 1997-1999 (Blanks spaces in the table indicate that the data were not reported in 1997.)

	1997		1998		1999	
<i>Coached Planning Class</i>	<i>Students</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Students</i>	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Students</i>	<i>Parcels</i>
Rural Forest District			3	3	9	10
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)			6	10	12	18
Forest Production District			0	0	7	7
Vashon Island			25	37	21	24
Urban Area			0	0	0	0
Total	28*		36**	55**	56**	70**
<i>Forest Advisor Class</i>						
Rural Forest District			0	0	1	1
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)			5	7	1	1
Forest Production District			0	0	1	1
Vashon Island			2	2	0	0
Urban Area			6	6	0	0
Total	17*		17**	20**	7**	7**

* This is the total for the entire county. Information for the various areas within the county was not reported in 1997.

** These totals exceed the sum of the various areas due the fact that some of the records do not match parcels in the GIS data. Furthermore, some of the people participating in classes do not own forestland.

Current Use Taxation

There are three categories of current use taxation programs related to forestlands: Forestland (RCW84.33), Timberland (RCW84.34) and the forest stewardship land category of the Public Benefit Rating System (PBRs) (RCW84.34). The Forestland Program is available to landowners with at least 20 acres of land devoted to forestry. The Timberland Program is available to landowners with between 5 and 20 acres of forestland and requires a forest management plan. The forest stewardship land category of the PBRs program is available to landowners with at least four acres of forestland and requires a forest stewardship plan. Typically, a property in the Timberlands or PBRs Program has some acreage reserved for a home site or agricultural area, and the remaining acreage is managed as forest and enrolled in the program.

This report documents the 1999 applications to the three Current Use Taxation programs, with a comparison to the 1997 and 1998 applications, and provides a summary of the total enrollment in the three programs to date. As can be seen in Table 10 (page 10), the number of applications has remained fairly steady over the last two years in each of the geographic areas analyzed. However, the number of acres in both the Timberland and Forestland applications declined in 1999, which suggests that people are enrolling smaller parcels, not surprising given the parcelization discussed earlier in this report.

Table 11 (page 11) shows the properties removed from Current Use Taxation in 1999. Sixty-three parcels totaling 3883 acres were removed from Forestland. Four of these parcels totaling 41 acres were transferred from Forestland to Timberland. Three thousand sixty-one acres went into federal ownership as part of a land swap with Plum Creek. Forty-three acres were acquired by King County from Palmer Coking Coal Company. Eighteen acres were transferred from Timberland to Forestland. Thus, 763 acres were removed from Current Use and remain in private ownership. The majority of these are in the south part of the County in the vicinity of Black Diamond or along the west wall of the Snoqualmie Valley in the north.

Finally, Table 12 (page 11) shows the total number of properties enrolled in the Current Use programs as of the end of 1999. Forty-one percent of the private land in the Rural Forest District is enrolled in one of the programs. Ninety-five percent of the private land in the FPD is enrolled. Map 4 shows the geographic distribution of all the properties enrolled, as well as the 1999 applications.

Transfer of Development Credits

1999 was a very productive year for the Transfer of Development Credits program. The Interagency Review Committee received and reviewed TDC Sending Site applications for 20 sites, totaling approximately 1300 acres and 500 transferable credits. Eleven of these sending site applications were from sites in the Rural Forest District, totaling approximately 1125 acres and 177 credits. One Rural Forest District site was certified resulting in the conservation of 314 acres and the issuance of 62 credits. Map 5 shows the distribution of TDC sending sites.

Table 10: Current Use Taxation Applications, 1997-1999 (Blank spaces in the table indicate that the data were not calculated in 1997.)

	1997			1998			1999		
Public Benefit Rating System*									
	People	Parcels	Acres	People	Parcels	Acres	People	Parcels	Acres**
Rural Forest District	15			1	1	5	0	0	0
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)				36	43	178	4	4	17
Forest Production District				0	0	0	1	1	5
Vashon Island				5	6	30	6	8	36
Urban Area				4	4	34	0	0	0
Total	66***			46	54	247	11	13	59
Timberlands Program									
Rural Forest District	13		200	5	8	115	9	10	125
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)				7	10	98	7	11	58
Forest Production District				4	9	101	3	5	97
Vashon Island				13	20	179	13	23	124
Unknown location				1	13	145	0	0	0
Total	51***		550***	28****	60	638	34****	49	489
Forestland Program									
Rural Forest District			780	9	13	252	7	30	628
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)				1	1	22	1	4	31
Forest Production District				2	15	5875	3	12	4461
Vashon Island				2	5	120	1	3	33
Unknown location				1	1	1	0	0	0
Total				14****	35	6270	12	49	5153
Total of all 3 Programs									
Rural Forest District				15	22	372	16	40	753
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)				44	54	298	12	19	106
Forest Production District				6	24	5976	7	18	4563
Vashon Island				20	31	329	20	34	193
Urban Area				4	4	34	0	0	0
Unknown location				2	14	146	0	0	0
Total				91	149	7155	57	111	5615

*The 1997 and 1998 data include all categories of the PBRs program. The 1999 data includes only those applications that used the forestry category.

**The acreage figure reported for 1999 is the actual acreage enrolled in the program. For previous years, the total acreage of the parcel was reported.

***This is the total for the entire county. Information for the various areas within the county was not reported in 1997.

****These numbers differ from the sum of the different areas either because several landowners own parcels in more than one area or because parcels did not match with the county's GIS data.

Table 11: Properties removed from Current Use Taxation, 1999

Removals from Forestland		
	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Rural Forest District	23	299
Forest Production District	19	3231
Vashon Island	3	94
Rural Area (outside the RFD and Vashon)	2	3
Urban	14	251
Total	61	3878
Removals from PBRs/Timber		
	<i>Parcels</i>	<i>Acres</i>
Rural Forest District	2	36
Forest Production District	0	0
Vashon Island	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	2	36

Table 12: Properties enrolled in Current Use Taxation Program as of 1999

	People	Parcels	Acres*
Public Benefit Rating System (Forest Stewardship Land Category)			
Rural Forest District	3	4	18
Rural Area (outside the RFD)	12	12	51
Forest Production District	2	2	16
Vashon Island	11	14	65
Urban Area	0	0	0
Total	28	32	151
Timberlands Program			
Rural Forest District	48	63	792
Rural Area (outside the RFD)	58	91	731
Forest Production District	21	29	438
Vashon Island	66	110	685
Urban Area	0	0	0
Total	184	293	2646
Forestland Program			
Rural Forest District	120	520	15,785
Rural Area (outside the RFD)	95	229	4524
Forest Production District	92	1008	250,717
Vashon Island	15	29	587
Urban Area	15	65	1778
Total	337	1851	273,391
Total of all 3 Programs			
Rural Forest District	171	587	16,595
Rural Area (outside the RFD)	165	332	5270
Forest Production District	115	1039	251,171
Vashon Island	92	153	1337
Urban Area	15	65	1778
Total	549	2176	276,188

*Indicates acreage enrolled in the management plan.

1999 Highs and Lows

Highs

Mitchell Hill (Map 6) - The Transfer of Development Credits program completed its first project with the transfer of 62 development credits on the 313 acre McCormick Forest to Port Blakely, developer of the Issaquah Highlands. Port Blakely paid \$2.75 million in return for the right to construct an additional 500,000 square feet of commercial space in the Issaquah Highlands. This transfer was part of a larger effort to conserve forestland on Mitchell Hill. In addition, the County worked with WADNR to purchase the development rights on 120 acres of forestland owned by the Mitchell Hill Partnership. The completion of these two projects creates a continuous forested link between the Grand Ridge open space to the west and 1000 acres of WADNR forestland to the south-east.

Rock Creek (Map 6) – The Friends of Rock Creek Valley was formed in 1999 with a mission to protect the approximately 24 square mile Rock Creek Valley from additional development. Led by Joan Burlingame, the Friends have been very successful in generating interest from local citizens about the importance of conserving the valley. The conservation of forestland is a high priority for the Friends, and they have been working closely with the KC forestry staff, the WRIA 8 staff, and the King County Rural Forest Commission to achieve their goals. The Rock Creek Valley corresponds closely with the Cedar River / Ravensdale Rural Forest Focus Area as defined in the proposed 2000 Comprehensive Plan Update. The forestry staff views collaboration with local citizen groups as one of the best ways to conserve private forestlands. Hopefully, the successful collaboration with the Friends of Rock Creek will stimulate the development of similar efforts in other parts of the County.

Tolt Highlands (Map 6) – The Tolt Highlands area comprises roughly 3500 acres of forestland that has recently been sold by Weyerhaeuser to smaller private owners. One hundred and fifty-six of these parcels are greater than 10 acres in size. Landowners in the Tolt Highlands have formed the Tolt River Highlands Homeowners Association, in part to share ideas about the conservation of forestland in the area. The association has a website that points landowners in the direction of various conservation programs. To date, 53 parcels have been enrolled in the Current Use Taxation programs, and 19 have received technical assistance from County foresters. This type of cooperative effort among neighboring landowners has a great deal of potential in terms of conserving forestland.

Low

Chateaus at Greenbrier (Map 6) – Ninety acres of forestland in the Rural Forest District near Lake Sawyer were rezoned from RA-10 to RA-5, potentially resulting in additional development in the RFD. As a condition of the rezone, the developer was required to cluster the lots and set aside 72 acres as open space. However, the 72 acres were not

permanently protected, but rather may be developed if the Urban Growth Boundary is redrawn or the Comprehensive Plan revised – both possible future outcomes. Rezone decisions that result in increased density in the RFD conflict with the County's goal of achieving an average density of 1 home per 20 acres in this district.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As is clear from the Rural Forest District parcel distribution data, there is a trend in the Rural Area of the county toward smaller lot sizes. The likely occurrence is that large landowners are segregating their land and selling it as 20-acre homesites. The new owners are in turn subdividing their 20-acre parcels into 5 and 10 acre parcels. This trend is disturbing, as it is resulting in the fragmentation of the forested landscape by houses and roads. In addition, visual observation of aerial photos suggests that many of the new landowners are clearing much of their land for pasture. In 1996, the average parcel size in the Rural Forest District was 16.2 acres. By the end of 1999, it had dropped to 13.8 acres. Given that the County's goal is to maintain an average lot size of 20 acres in the RFD, this trend warrants the development of additional incentives or regulatory measures that prevent further subdivision. Without such measures, the County will likely lose the remaining contiguous forest, and with it any forestry industry, in the Rural Area.

The continued interest in the technical assistance and education programs shows that the forestry program has continued to be successful in working with small landowners to assist them in stewarding their forestland. The fact that a relatively large number of these landowners own land in the Forest Production District emphasizes the need to focus on this area as well as the Rural Forest District. Many of the small lots that were created prior to the establishment of the 80-acre zone in the FPD are now being developed for residential use, and it is important that these landowners steward these forests that provide a buffer to the larger industrial ownerships.

The large amount of interest in the TDC program suggests that this program has a great deal of potential if the County can work with the cities and developers to generate receiving sites. Forest landowners are likely to lose interest in the program if they do not see progress being made with transactions. At this time, the TDC program is the only County program that provides a financial incentive approaching the value of forestland for development. With this in mind, the County should consider additional funding for the TDC Bank, or the development of a Purchase of Development Rights Program for forestland.

While the County has been fairly successful in conserving forestland in both the Rural Forest District and the Forest Production District, the threat of continued fragmentation and conversion is very real, as suggested by the change that has occurred in the RFD since 1996. If the County hopes to achieve its goal of maintaining an average 20-acre parcel size in the RFD and a viable forestry industry in the FPD, additional incentive programs, or possibly regulatory measures, will be necessary. The existing programs

have been effective, but they do not provide the financial incentive needed to address the disparity in value of land used for forestry as opposed to residential development.

Appendix

Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs)

In an effort to provide helpful information to the WRIA planning process, this appendix includes 1999 parcel and owner distribution in the Rural Forest District and Forest Production District for each of the WRIAs. It also includes a summary of participation in the incentive programs in each WRIA.

Parcel and Ownership Distribution

WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie

Rural Forest District

Table 13: Rural Forest District Parcel Size distribution in WRIA 7, 1999

Parcel Size	Parcels	Acres
≥ 100	19	4478
20 – 99.99	514	15,094
17.5 – 19.99	150	2919
7.5 – 17.49	230	2594
4 – 7.49	497	2566
< 4	787	976
Total	2197	28,627

Table 14: Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution in WRIA 7, 1999

Ownership	# of owners	Total acres
≥ 500	6	9307
100 – 499.99	25	4936
40 – 99.99	81	4653
20 – 39.99	177	4592
4 – 19.99	477	4152
< 4	545	728
Total	1311	28,368*

*An owner was not identified in the data for 258 acres.

Table 15: Public Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 7, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Washington State	75	3038
King County	62	702
United States	8	627
City of North Bend	2	80
Total	147	4447

Table 16: Large Private Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 7, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Weterhaeuser	82	3831
Port Blakely	30	546
Chen	20	512
Total	132	4891

Forest Production District

Total acres in the FPD in WRIA 7 = 486,899

Table 17: Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 7, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
United States	668	293,404
Washington State	236	44,733
City of Seattle	57	12,704
King County	31	1868
City of Tacoma	1	20
City of Snoqualmie	1	16
Total	994	352,745

Table 18: Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 7, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Weyerhaeuser	261	105,369
Longview Fiber	49	9748
Hoenig, Gordon E.	2	1162
Manke	22	1065
Plum Creek	3	977
Burlington Northern	46	933
Cugini Land and Timber	9	922
Trust for Public Land	5	799
Total	397	120,975

WRIA 8 – Cedar/Sammamish

Rural Forest District

Table 19: Rural Forest District Parcel Size distribution in WRIA 8, 1999

Parcel Size	Parcels	Acres
≥ 100	11	2081
20 – 99.99	139	4206
17.5 – 19.99	68	1330
7.5 – 17.49	85	970
4 – 7.49	108	567
< 4	264	318
Total	675	9472

Table 20: Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution in WRIA 8, 1999

Ownership	# of owners	Acres
≥ 500	3	4057
100 – 499.99	9	1660
40 – 99.99	19	1031
20 – 39.99	52	1510
4 – 19.99	109	979
< 4	171	215
Total	363	9452*

*An owner was not identified in the data for 20 acres.

Table 21: Public Landowners in the Rural Forest District in WRIA 8, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
King County	39	1907
Washington State	31	1028
United States	3	47
Total	73	2982

The only large private forest landowner in the Rural Forest District in WRIA 8 is Plum Creek, with 47 parcels totaling 1122 acres.

Forest Production District

Total acres in the FPD in WRIA 8 = 101,334 acres

Table 22: Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 8, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
City of Seattle	195	83,204
Washington State	80	10,206
United States	6	1366
King County	5	1301
City of Tacoma	2	6
Total	288	96,083

Table 23: Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 8, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Weyerhaeuser	13	2569
Plum Creek	37	1291
Southworth Land Association Inc.	30	615
Total	80	4475

WRIA 9 – Green

Rural Forest District

Table 24: Rural Forest District Parcel Size Distribution in WRIA 9, 1999

Parcel Size	Parcels	Acres
≥ 100	11	2798
20 – 99.99	120	3870
17.5 – 19.99	73	1404
7.5 – 17.49	94	1062
4 – 7.49	123	690
< 4	191	201
Total	612	10,027

Table 25: Rural Forest District Ownership Distribution in WRIA 9, 1999

Ownership	# of owners	Acres
≥ 500	2	4172
100 – 499.99	16	3260
40 – 99.99	17	915
20 – 39.99	25	753
4 – 19.99	83	703
< 4	125	135
Total	268	9938

Table 26: Public Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 9, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Washington State	15	342
King County	7	108
Total	22	450

Table 27: Large Private Landowners in the RFD in WRIA 9, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Palmer Coking Coal	95	1438
Plum Creek	65	2734
Total	160	4172

Forest Production District

Total acres in the FPD in WRIA 9 = 169,267 acres

Table 28: Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 9, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
United States	106	31,969
Washington State	171	26,944
City of Tacoma	159	14,961
City of Seattle	11	2464
King County	2	37
Enumclaw School District #216	1	1
Total	450	76,373

Table 29: Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 9, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Plum Creek	184	57,378
Weyerhaeuser	53	14,490
Giustina Resources	42	14,336
Burlington Northern Railroad	32	1188
Palmer Coking Coal	13	907
Total	324	88,299

WRIA 10 – White

Rural Forest District

There is no RFD land in WRIA 10

Forest Production District

Total acres in the FPD in WRIA 10 = 52,465 acres

Table 30: Public Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 10, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
United States	74	16,879
Washington State	15	1658
King County	1	1
Total	90	18,538

Table 31: Large Private Landowners in the FPD in WRIA 10, 1999

Owner	Parcels	Acres
Weyerhaeuser	116	32,607
Plum Creek	7	878
Total	123	33,485

Incentive Programs

The distribution of technical assistance efforts across the four WRIAs suggests that the majority of the program's success has occurred in WRIAs 8 and 9. This is due primarily to a greater level of interest in these WRIAs. The distribution also suggests that there is a need to proactively target landowners in the Green River watershed (WRIA 10). The portion of WRIA 11 (the White River watershed) in King County is relatively small and consists of less contiguous forest than the other WRIAs. Additional efforts are not necessarily warranted in WRIA 11.

Table 32: Technical Assistance Program by WRIA, 1999

	People	Parcels	Acres
<i>On site visits</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	27	47	NA
WRIA 8 – Cedar	21	36	NA
WRIA 9 – Green	10	17	NA
WRIA 10 - White	0	0	NA
<i>Plans completed</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	18	34	588
WRIA 8 – Cedar	16	29	291
WRIA 9 – Green	6	13	303
WRIA 10 - White	0	0	0

As was the case with the technical assistance efforts, the majority of interest in the education programs has been in WRIAs 8 and 9. Additional outreach is warranted in the Green River watershed.

Table 33: Education Program by WRIA, 1999

	People	Parcels	Acres
<i>Coached Planning Class</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	14	16	NA
WRIA 8 – Cedar	8	15	NA
WRIA 9 – Green	4	4	NA
WRIA 10 - White	0	0	NA
<i>Forest Advisor Class</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	2	2	NA
WRIA 8 – Cedar	1	1	NA
WRIA 9 – Green	0	0	NA
WRIA 10 - White	0	0	NA

Table 34: Current Use Taxation Program Enrollment by WRIA, 1999

	People	Parcels	Acres
<i>Forestland Program</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	147	770	131,397
WRIA 8 – Cedar	50	221	7666
WRIA 9 – Green	88	692	100,263
WRIA 10 – White	16	139	33,479
<i>Timberland Program</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	77	108	1148
WRIA 8 – Cedar	19	33	265
WRIA 9 – Green	28	36	499
WRIA 10 - White	4	6	50
<i>PBRs Forestry Category</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	6	7	33
WRIA 8 – Cedar	8	8	31
WRIA 9 – Green	3	3	22
WRIA 10 - White	0	0	0
<i>Total of all 3 Programs</i>			
WRIA 7 – Snoqualmie	230	885	132,578
WRIA 8 – Cedar	77	262	7962
WRIA 9 – Green	119	731	100,784
WRIA 10 - White	20	145	33,592